



2026:AHC:13329

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 132 of 2026

Girish Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Alok Ranjan Tripathi, Kamlesh Kumar Tripathi
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Brij Kumar Saroj, C.S.C., Sudhir Bharti

Court No. - 55

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Pankaj Kumar Gupta, learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents and Mr. Sudhir Bharti, learned counsel for the respondent-Gaon Sabha.

2. The instant petition has been filed for the following relief:

"(i) issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari quashing the order passed by the Respondent no.3 dated 20.01.2025 by passing illegal and fake order in complying the order of this Hon'ble Court dated 22.07.2024;

(ii) issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the Respondent no.2 & 3 to reinstate the entries of Akar Patra 41 & 45 of previous records;

(iii) issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the Respondent no.3 to initiate the proceeding against the respondent no.4 & 5 illegal encroachers of plot no. 106, 107, 108, 110, 111 situated in Gram Sabha Kanmiswa, Tehsil- Nichlaul, District- Maharajganj and eject them from the land in question.

(iv) issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the Respondent no.3 to correct the revenue records Akar Patra 41 & 45 according to the records of 41 & 45 previous in 1359 Fasali."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the private respondent along with others are recorded over the plot which was reserved for

forest. He further submitted that entry of the private respondent should be expunged by the authorities. He further submitted that the representation filed by the petitioner has been rejected under the impugned order in arbitrary manner. He further submitted that the impugned order should be set aside and entry of the plot in question should be corrected forthwith.

4. I have considered the argument advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

5. There is no dispute about the fact that the private respondent along with others are recorded over the plot in question.

6. The representation filed by the petitioner has been rejected by the authority under the impugned order recording finding that entry of tenure holders appears to be correct and remedy for expunging the entry in respect to the plot in question lies before the appropriate Court.

7. Perusal of the finding recorded by the Tahsildar, Maharajganj while passing the impugned order dated 20.1.20205 as well as revenue entry of the plot in question demonstrates that there is no illegality in the impugned order rejecting the representation of the petitioner.

8. Under the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 the proper procedure has been prescribed for initiating regular proceeding as well as summary proceeding in respect to entry as such public interest litigation cannot be entertained.

9. No interference is required in the matter.

10. The instant public interest litigation is dismissed.

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)

January 20, 2026

Rameez